



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,264	10/22/2001	Mark H. Lucovsky	3090	9015

7590

12/02/2005

LAW OFFICE OF ALBERT S. MICHALIK, PLLC.
704-228TH AVENUE NE
SUITE 193
SAMMAMISH, WA 98074

EXAMINER

STEVENS, ROBERT

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/021,264

Applicant(s)

LUCOVSKY ET AL.

Examiner

Robert M. Stevens

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/23/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 8/29/2005 to the original application filed 10/22/2001 by Lucovsky et al entitled "Schema-Based Services for Identity-Based Access to Calendar Data".
2. The Office withdraws all previous rejections of the claims in light of the amendment.
3. The Office has issued new rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), in light of the amendment. See the rationale given below.
4. Claims 4-23 are pending. Claims 4, 12 and 14 are independent. Claims 1-3 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 4-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Slaughter et al (US Patent No. 6,868,447, provisionally filed Jun. 5, 1998 and issued

Mar. 15, 2005, hereafter referred to as "Slaughter") in view of Lange et al (US Patent No. 6,163,794, filed Oct. 23, 1998 and issued Dec. 19, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Lange").

Regarding independent claim 4, Slaughter discloses:

In a computer network, a method comprising:
 receiving a request from a device having a service running thereon
 using a service-to-service protocol to retrieve ... data from a data store,
 the request including associated identity information; (Fig. 6 in context of
 Figures 36-37)
 reading from the data store to obtain ... data in response to the
 request, wherein access to the data store is based on the associated
 identity information; (Fig. 20 in context of Abstract, and Figures 36-37)
 ... , and including a defined schema for ... data, the defined schema
 operable to be interpreted by the service running on the device; (Abstract)
 and
 ...

However, Slaughter does not explicitly disclose:

...
 ... calendar ... ;
 ... calendar ... ;
 constructing a calendar document including at least part of the
 requested calendar data, and including ... calendar ... , ... ; and
 returning the calendar document to the device in response to the
 request.

Lange, though, discloses:

...
 ... calendar ... ; (col. 13 lines 29-26)
 ... calendar ... ; (col. 13 lines 29-26)
 constructing a calendar document including at least part of the
 requested calendar data, and including ... calendar ... , ... ; (col. 13 lines
 29-26) and

returning the calendar document to the device in response to the request. (col. 13 lines 29-26 and Fig. 1)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lange for the benefit of Slaughter, because to do so would have allowed one to implement a program that is operable to utilize a service within a network system, as taught by Lange in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., network-based services.

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent upon claim 4:

Slaughter further discloses:

wherein the schema includes at least one defined field for extending the schema. (Abstract)

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent upon claim 5:

Slaughter does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the at least one defined field comprises data corresponding to a calendar item name.

Lange, though, discloses:

wherein the at least one defined field comprises data corresponding to a calendar item name. (col. 10 lines 20-63 in context of col. 13 lines 29-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lange for the benefit of Slaughter, because to do so would have allowed one to implement a program that is operable to utilize a service within a network system, as taught by Lange in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., network-based services.

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent upon claim 5:

Slaughter does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the at least one defined field comprises data corresponding to a calendar item date.

Lange, though, discloses:

wherein the at least one defined field comprises data corresponding to a calendar item date. (col. 10 lines 20-63 in context of col. 13 lines 29-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lange for the benefit of Slaughter, because to do so would have allowed one to implement a program that is operable to utilize a service within a network system, as taught by Lange in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., network-based services.

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent upon claim 5:

Slaughter does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the at least one defined field comprises data corresponding to a calendar item duration.

Lange, though, discloses:

wherein the at least one defined field comprises data corresponding to a calendar item duration. (col. 10 lines 20-63 in context of col. 13 lines 29-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lange for the benefit of Slaughter, because to do so would have allowed one to implement a program that is operable to utilize a service within a network system, as taught by Lange in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., network-based services.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent upon claim 5:

Slaughter does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the at least one defined field comprises data corresponding to a calendar item list of attendees.

Lange, though, discloses:

wherein the at least one defined field comprises data corresponding to a calendar item list of attendees. (col. 10 lines 20-63 in context of col. 13 lines 29-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lange for the benefit of Slaughter, because to do so would have allowed one to implement a program that is operable to utilize a service

within a network system, as taught by Lange in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., network-based services.

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent upon claim 5:

Slaughter does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the at least one defined field comprises data corresponding to a calendar item notification setting.

Lange, though, discloses:

wherein the at least one defined field comprises data corresponding to a calendar item notification setting. (col. 10 lines 20-63 in context of col. 13 lines 29-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lange for the benefit of Slaughter, because to do so would have allowed one to implement a program that is operable to utilize a service within a network system, as taught by Lange in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., network-based services.

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent upon claim 5:

Slaughter does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the at least one defined field comprises data corresponding to a calendar item priority setting.

Lange, though, discloses:

wherein the at least one defined field comprises data corresponding to a calendar item priority setting. (col. 10 lines 20-63 in context of col. 13 lines 29-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lange for the benefit of Slaughter, because to do so would have allowed one to implement a program that is operable to utilize a service within a network system, as taught by Lange in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., network-based services.

Claim 12 is directed to a computer readable medium having instructions to implement the method of claim 4. As such, this claim is substantially similar to claim 4, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 13 is substantially similar to claim 5, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding independent claim 14, Slaughter discloses:

In a computer network, a method comprising:

providing access to a network using a device, the access requiring associated identity information corresponding to the device; (Fig. 20 in context of Abstract)

receiving a request for ... data stored in a data store from a service accessible via the network using a service to service protocol, the request based on including the associated identity information; (Fig. 6 in context of Figures 36 and 37)

determining if the request is an allowable request based on the associated identity information; (Fig. 20, especially #306) and

if the request is allowable, (Fig. 20, especially #306)

However, Slaughter does not explicitly disclose:

...
... ;
... calendar ... ;
... ; and
..., returning a calendar document to the device, the calendar document including having at least part of the requested calendar data, the calendar document including a schema associated with the service.

Lange, though, discloses:

...
... calendar ... ; (col. 13 lines 29-36)
... ; and
..., returning a calendar document to the device, the calendar document including having at least part of the requested calendar data, the calendar document including a schema associated with the service.
(col. 13 lines 29-36 and Fig. 1)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lange for the benefit of Slaughter, because to do so would have allowed one to implement a program that is operable to utilize a service within a network system, as taught by Lange in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., network-based services.

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent upon claim 14:

Slaughter does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the service comprises a calendar service.

Lange, though, discloses:

wherein the service comprises a calendar service. (col. 13 lines 29-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lange for the benefit of Slaughter, because to do so would have allowed one to implement a program that is operable to utilize a service within a network system, as taught by Lange in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., network-based services.

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent upon claim 14:

Slaughter further discloses:

wherein the schema comprises a ... schema. (Abstract)

However, Slaughter does not explicitly disclose:

... calendar ...

Lange, though, discloses:

... calendar ... (col. 13 lines 29-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lange for the benefit of Slaughter, because to do so would have allowed one to implement a program that is operable to utilize a service

within a network system, as taught by Lange in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., network-based services.

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent upon claim 14:

Slaughter does not explicitly disclose:

manipulating the calendar data requested if the request is determined to be an allowable request.

Lange, though, discloses:

manipulating the calendar data requested if the request is determined to be an allowable request. (col. 10 lines 20-63 in context of col. 13 lines 29-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lange for the benefit of Slaughter, because to do so would have allowed one to implement a program that is operable to utilize a service within a network system, as taught by Lange in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., network-based services.

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent upon claim 17:

Slaughter does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the manipulating comprises a query manipulation.

Lange, though, discloses:

wherein the manipulating comprises a query manipulation. (col. 10 lines 20-63 in context of col. 13 lines 29-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lange for the benefit of Slaughter, because to do so would have allowed one to implement a program that is operable to utilize a service within a network system, as taught by Lange in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., network-based services.

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent upon claim 17:

Slaughter does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the manipulating comprises an insert manipulation.

Lange, though, discloses:

wherein the manipulating comprises an insert manipulation. (col. 10 lines 20-63 in context of col. 13 lines 29-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lange for the benefit of Slaughter, because to do so would have allowed one to implement a program that is operable to utilize a service within a network system, as taught by Lange in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., network-based services.

Regarding claim 20, which is dependent upon claim 17:

Slaughter does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the manipulating comprises a delete manipulation.

Lange, though, discloses:

wherein the manipulating comprises a delete manipulation. (col. 10 lines 20-63 in context of col. 13 lines 29-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lange for the benefit of Slaughter, because to do so would have allowed one to implement a program that is operable to utilize a service within a network system, as taught by Lange in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., network-based services.

Regarding claim 21, which is dependent upon claim 17:

Slaughter does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the manipulating comprises an update manipulation.

Lange, though, discloses:

wherein the manipulating comprises an update manipulation. (col. 10 lines 20-63 in context of col. 13 lines 29-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lange for the benefit of Slaughter, because to do so would have allowed one to implement a program that is operable to utilize a service within a network system, as taught by Lange in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., network-based services.

Regarding claim 22, which is dependent upon claim 17:

Slaughter does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the manipulating comprises a replace manipulation.

Lange, though, discloses:

wherein the manipulating comprises a replace manipulation. (col. 10 lines 20-63 in context of col. 13 lines 29-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lange for the benefit of Slaughter, because to do so would have allowed one to implement a program that is operable to utilize a service within a network system, as taught by Lange in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., network-based services.

Regarding claim 23, which is dependent upon claim 17:

Slaughter does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the manipulating comprises a send message manipulation.

Lange, though, discloses:

wherein the manipulating comprises a send message manipulation.
(col. 10 lines 20-63 in context of col. 13 lines 29-36)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lange for the benefit of Slaughter, because to do so

Art Unit: 2176

would have allowed one to implement a program that is operable to utilize a service within a network system, as taught by Lange in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., network-based services.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is noted that Applicant's amendments have changed the scope of the claims.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Non-patent Literature

US Patent Application Publications

US Patents

Tsai	6,907,465
Weschler, Jr.	6,757,720
Kumar et al	6,542,515
Slaughter et al	6,868,447

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The current fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Additionally, the main number for Technology Center 2100 is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert M. Stevens
Reg. No. 47,972
Art Unit 2176
Date: November 26, 2005

rms

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
11/26/2005